



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/473,078	12/28/1999	ROY SHKEDI	JMB-2-0003	9573

7590 05/23/2002

FAY SHARPE BEALL  
FAGAN MINNICH & MCKEE  
1100 SUPERIOR AVENUE  
SUITE 700  
CLEVELAND, OH 441142518

EXAMINER

JANVIER, JEAN D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3622

DATE MAILED: 05/23/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/473,078

Applicant(s)

SHKEDI, ROY

Examiner

Jean D Janvier

Art Unit

3622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 6.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Specification*

On page 4 and line 8, "one distributors" should apparently be --one distributor--.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Indeed, claims 36-37 recite a storage medium or device having computer codes encoded thereon and these computer codes are executed by a computer or machine to perform the method and system of claims 1 and 27 respectively. Applicant needs to clearly recite the limitations of claims 1 and 27 within the bodies of claims 36 and 37 or simply rewrite claims 36 and 37 in independent form. Further, no art rejection will be applied to claims 36-37.

Claim 2 recites the limitation "the broadcasting (step b)". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim since there is no step (b) in claim 1. For Examination purpose, the Examiner assumes that the Applicant meant to refer to step (Two), as recited in claim 1.

Art Unit: 3622

Claim 19 recites the limitation "the node in step a or steps b through f". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim since there are no steps (a-f) in claim 1. For Examination purpose, the Examiner assumes that the Applicant meant to refer to steps (ONE to SIX), as recited in claim 1.

Claim 24 recites the limitation "the logic protocol". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim since Independent claim 1 never recites a "logic protocol". For Examination purpose, the Examiner assumes that the Applicant meant to refer to --a logic protocol--.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Roth, PCT Application WO 98/34189.

As per claims 1 and 27, Roth discloses a method and/or system for providing advertisements from a central server to viewers (10) who access web sites (14) over the Internet based at least in part on the viewers or users (10) characteristics or profile, which match a set of criteria or characteristics associated with the advertisements (16A) from the advertisers or

Art Unit: 3622

distributors. The central server stores both advertisements (16A), which are to be displayed and an information database (16B). The database or DB (16B) includes information about viewers' profile, information about the characteristics of particular web sites and other information relevant to which advertisements should be displayed for particular viewers (10). Further, proposed bids submitted by different advertisers for the right to display their messages on the viewers' (10) computer screens are evaluated in real time in order to determine which particular advertisement will be displayed to a viewer (10). Each proposed bid can specify a price or amount that the advertiser is willing to pay for the opportunity to display an advertising message or commercial to a computer user or viewer (10) who has a particular set of characteristics (profile) and on a web site (14) having web page (12) that meets a particular set of criteria or conditions. Finally, the system includes a web server (16) having databases, bidding agents (30), which compare the characteristics of view-ops to the specification in proposed bids and which submits bids as appropriate and bid selection logic which decides which bids to accept for each particular view-op (the fact that the viewer has accessed a web page having an HTML reference to the advertising server). See abstract.

As per claims 2, 8-9,13-14 and 31-35, Roth discloses an Internet advertising system wherein Web Server 310 of fig. 3 (communication node) receives an HTML reference (a view op) or HTTP request from web browser 12 when the viewer or visitor (10) accesses a web site having a link to advertising Web Server or Web Server 310 (page 6: 5-25). If the characteristics of a viewer or visitor (10) meet the criteria of a proposed bid, bidding agent (30) will submit a bid to view server 320 based on a minimum or maximum bid or a fixed amount or budget an

advertiser is willing to spend for the right to display his advertising message to a particular viewer (10) having a set of characteristics or profile. After receiving input from bidding agents (30), the bid selection logic 16C in view server 320 selects the highest bid and indicates to the Web Server 310 which advertisement from database (16A) should be displayed in response to the HTTP request. In response to the input from view server 320, the web server 310 delivers the appropriate advertisement to the viewer or visitor (10). It should further be understood that the steps of collecting responses from distributors or advertisers are performed automatically using the bidding agents (30), bid logic 16C, Web Server 310, view server 320 in conjunction with the viewers' profile and the advertisers' or distributors' targeted profile or characteristics and an amount (predetermined threshold) that the advertisers or distributors are willing to pay for a specific targeted profile and wherein the viewers' profile and the advertisers' or distributors' targeted profile are stored in databases corresponding to Web server 310 (page 3: 19 to page 4:10; page 12: 13-17; page 13: 13-23; page 16: 1-9; fig.1; see abstract).

As per claims 3, 7, 10,11-12 and 23-25, Roth disclose a method and/or system wherein bidding agent (30) will submit a bid to view server 320 if the characteristics or profile of a viewer or visitor (10), a human, meet the criteria of a proposed bid from an advertiser or distributor. The visitor's profile contains at least information from web sites previously visited, IP address of the visitor's PC, demographic information provided by the visitor during registration, which are stored in database 16B of fig.1. It should further be understood that the visitor will fill out a registration form, containing a plurality of fields including a header, where he will provide his personal information used in determining whether or not his profile or

characteristics match the criteria or characteristics specified by an advertiser in a bid (page 1: 23 to page 2: 2; page 3: 23 to page 4: 7; page 13: 13-23; page 15: 11-15; page 15: 20-25; page 36: 4-19; page 37: 23-24; page 15: 11-15).

As per claims 4, 6, 15-17, 19 and 26, it is understood that once it is determined that the visitor's characteristics or profile match the characteristics of a proposed bid from a particular advertiser, Web Server 310 will deliver an appropriate advertisement, in the form of a banner, text, imager, etc., to the visitor and wherein the advertisement contains a hyperlink associated with the advertiser's web site. Upon clicking on the hyperlink, the visitor can visit the advertiser's web site in order to receive more information about an advertised product or even purchase the product or another product (follow-up). The visitor's or viewer's interaction with the advertisement is tracked or monitored (audited), thereby making sure that the advertiser's message was actually viewed by the viewer or visitor (10). Visitor's purchases, based at least in part on viewed advertisements, are closely monitored or tracked (audited) and subsequently used to further enhance the visitor's profile wherein this enhanced profile is used in the matching of characteristics by bidding agent (30) or intermediary. Finally, an advertiser can effectively use the tracking or auditing data to decide whether or not a visitor has previously visited his web site and based on this determination, the advertiser might bid more or less money (page 3: 19 to page 4: 10; page 13: 13-23; page 17: 1-2; fig. 1; fig. 6B).

As per claims 20-22, Roth discloses a method for advertising on the Internet wherein a viewer or visitor (10) uses a client to visit web sites over the Internet. A cookie or file stored on

the visitor's client or computer collects data regarding the visitor's visits to these web sites and these data are subsequently analyzed and used along with the visitor's personal information to compose a profile for the visitor and wherein this profile is used in the matching of characteristics by bidding agent (30) or intermediary before an appropriate advertisement is sent to the visitor by Web Server 310, thereby eliminating the possibility to send irrelevant or unwanted advertisements to the visitor. Finally, an advertiser can effectively use the tracking or auditing data stored in the cookie to decide whether or not a visitor has previously visited his web site and based on this determination, the advertiser might bid more or less money (page 3: 19 to page 4: 10; page 13: 13-23; page 17: 1-2; page 36: 21 to page 37: 2; fig. 1; fig. 6B).

As per claims 28-30, Roth discloses a method and/or system for providing advertisements from a central server to viewers (10) who access web sites (14) over the Internet based at least in part on the viewers or users (10) characteristics or profile, which match a set of criteria or characteristics associated with the advertisements (16A) from the advertisers or distributors. The central server 16 stores both advertisements in a database (16A), which are to be displayed and an information database (16B) module containing the viewer's profile. The database or DB (16B) includes information about viewers' profile, information about the characteristics of particular web sites and other information relevant to which advertisements should be displayed for particular viewers (10). Further, proposed bids submitted by different advertisers for the right to display their messages on the viewers' (10) computer screens are evaluated in real time in order to determine which particular advertisement will be displayed to a viewer (10). Each proposed bid can specify a price or amount that the advertiser is willing to pay for the



opportunity to display an advertising message or commercial to a computer user or viewer (10) who has a particular set of characteristics (profile) and on a web site (14) having web page (12) that meets a particular set of criteria or conditions. Finally, the system includes a web server (16) having databases, bidding agents (30), which compare the characteristics of view-ops to the specification in proposed bids and which submits bids as appropriate and bid selection logic which decides which bids to accept for each particular view-op (the fact that the viewer has accessed a web page having an HTML reference to the advertising server). See abstract and fig. 1.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roth in view of Bezos, US Patent 6,029,141, filed in 1997.

As per claim 18, Roth does not expressly disclose a method and/or system wherein an agent or a system owner receives a payment or compensation resulting from a visitor at an advertiser's web site specified in an advertisement that was displayed on the visitor's terminal.

However, Bezos discloses a method and/or system for distributing product promotions to the public wherein an agent or associate or Amazon.com partner will set up a web site or associate's web site having a link or referral link to the Amazon.com site or Merchant's web site to recruit visitors or customers. Upon visiting an associate's web site using his PC, a visitor or customer can access information about products, such as books, sold at Amazon.com web site and if the customer or visitor wants to learn more about an advertised product or even make a purchase, he/she can click on the referral link associated with the advertised product. If the customer or visitor purchases the advertised product at the Merchant's web site, the associate will receive a commission or compensation for a successful referral based on some predefined criteria (See abstract; figs 1-2).

Therefore, an ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated at the time of the invention to incorporate Bezos' teachings into the Roth's system so as to have an advertiser compensate or pay the owner or agent of the Internet Advertising System for distributing the advertiser's messages to qualified viewers if and only if the viewers make purchases related to the products specified in the advertisements, thereby making the system more attractive to advertisers while eliminating the need for the advertisers to ensure that their messages were actually read by qualified viewers since the system is now a performance based system, that is the owner of the system will not be compensated unless a viewer makes a purchase corresponding to an advertised product.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roth.

Roth does not expressly disclose a method and/or system for at least transferring encrypted advertisements to a visitor.

However, transmitting encrypted data between at least two parties over a network in an effort to secure the transmission of the data so that the data are not tampered with is a well-established business method practiced or used in the industry for many years.

Therefore, an ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated at the time of the invention to incorporate the above disclosure into the Roth's system so as to at least encrypt an advertisement before it is transmitted to a qualified viewer (10), thereby making sure that the advertiser's message or advertisement was not tampered with or the integrity of the advertisement was not comprised in the process (authentication).

### **Conclusion**

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US Patent 5,724,521A to Dedrick. (IDS).

US Patent 5,794, 210 to Goldhaber et al (IDS).

Applicant is further directed to consult these pertinent references.

Application/Control Number: 09/473,078  
Art Unit: 3622

Page 11

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the Examiner should be directed to Jean D. Janvier, whose telephone number is (703) 308-6287). The aforementioned can normally be reached Monday-Thursday from 10:00AM to 6:00 PM EST. If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's Supervisor, Mr. Eric W. Stamber, can be reached at (703) 305- 8469.

**Please provide support, that is page and line numbers, for any amended or new claim, otherwise any new claim language that is introduced in an amended or new claim will be considered as new matter.**

JDJ  
05/17/02

*Stephen Gravini for exam*

STEPHEN GRAVINI  
PRIMARY EXAMINER